

REMARKS

In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Raleigh rejected pending claims 1-9 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application:

- A. Examiner Raleigh rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,075,318 to *Noll* et al.

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Raleigh's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-6 over *Noll*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Noll*. To warrant this §102(b) rejection of claims 1-6, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1 must be either expressly or inherently described in *Noll*. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1, because *Noll* fails to expressly or inherently describe, "characterized in that two flat surfaces are present at both sides of the pinch portion, said surfaces being parallel to the plane through said conductor wires, and in that clamping elements of the cap part abut against said surfaces" as originally recited in independent claim 1.

As to the traversal, a careful review of *Noll* reveals an erroneous interpretation by Examiner Raleigh of FIGS. 5a and 5b of *Noll*.

Specifically, as best shown in FIG. 5a, *Noll* teaches a lamp 41 and a socket 42 (i.e., according to the Examiner, the envelope part and the cap part respectively recited in independent claim 1). Lamp 41 has a pinched glass cap 43 provided with two (2) parallel supply leads 44 extending outwards beyond pinched glass cap 43. Socket 42 has two (2) metal contacts 46 for contacting corresponding electrical contacts of a lampholder (not shown) with each supply lead 44 being connected to a corresponding metal contact 46 of socket 42. Examiner Raleigh respectfully asserts that pinched glass cap 43 has two flat surfaces that are parallel to a plane through supply leads 44, and that socket 42 has clamping elements 46 abutting against the flat

surfaces of pinched glass cap 43. The Applicant respectfully asserts that this interpretation by Examiner Raleigh of FIGS. 5a and 5b of *Noll* is erroneous for a couple of reasons.

First, *Noll* unequivocally teaches metal contacts 46 exclusively contacting supply leads 44 for purposes of creating a satisfactory spacing of a contact point of supply leads/metal contacts 44/46 from pinched glass cap 43 whereby thermal problems are minimized. See, *Noll* at column 12, lines 20-40.

Second, as best shown in FIG. 5b, *Noll* actually teaches a clamping element 45 that is bent in a U-shaped fashion with two (2) limbs 45a bent inward slightly, and pinched glass cap 43 has a groove-like recess 39 and wedge-shaped projection 40 as opposed to flat surfaces. In operation, limbs 45a bend over wedge-shaped projection 40 into groove-like recess 39 to mechanically hold pinched glass cap 43 within an insertion opening 47 of socket 42. See, *Noll* at column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 10. Thus, *Noll* clearly does not explicitly or inherently describe limbs 45a of clamping element 45 abutting flat surfaces of pinched glass cap 43 as required by the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1. Moreover, the Applicant respectfully asserts that recess 39 and projection 40 are necessary for pinched glass cap 43 to facilitate clamp 45 in counteracting the force exerted on supply leads 44 by springs 53 via metal contacts 46 to thereby prevent glass cap 43 from being upwardly forced out of insertion opening 47 of socket 46. As such, clamp 45 abutting flat surfaces of pinched glass cap 43 would render claim 45 inoperative for its intended purpose of mechanically holding pinched glass cap 43 within insertion opening 47 of socket 46.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Noll* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-6 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2-6 are allowable over *Noll* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Noll*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Noll* is therefore respectfully requested.

- B. Examiner Raleigh rejected independent claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,075,318 to *Noll* et al.

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Raleigh's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 7-9 over *Noll*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Noll*. To warrant this §103(a) rejection of claims 7-9, *Noll* must teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 7. See, MPEP §2143.03. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §103(a) rejection of independent claim 7, because *Noll* fails to teach or suggest "characterized in that, when the envelope part and the cap part are fixed in a predetermined position relative to each other, the conductor wires are soldered or welded to the contact members, and two clamping elements are attached to the cap part, which two clamping elements abut against two flat surfaces present at both sides of the pinch portion, said surfaces being parallel to the plane through said conductor wires" as originally recited independent claim 7 for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Noll*. Moreover, the Applicant respectfully asserts any modification of *Noll* to include the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 7 would render *Noll* inoperable for its intended purpose as previously stated herein with respect to independent claim 1, and thus obviousness cannot logically follow. See, MPEP § 2143.01(VI).

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noll* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 7. Therefore, dependent claims 8 and 9 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 7. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 8 and 9 are allowable over *Noll* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 7 being allowable over *Noll*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Noll* is therefore respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Raleigh is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **April 16, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,
Johannes Antonius Adrianus
Maria Van Heeswijk

/Chris M. Ries, 45799/

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Chris M. Ries
Registration No. 45,799
Attorney for Appellant

/Darrin Wesley Harris, 40636/

WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY,
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant